RRR
ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT
JUNE 1993 VOLUME IV, NUMBER 6

Hands Off the Serbs!

by Murray N. Rothbard

I used to think that the ultra-Left, *not* the Social Democrats or the Commies, but the "independent-radical" Left, a floating melange of Left Trotskyites, pacifists, and left-anarchists, while hopeless and evil on "domestic" questions, were at least sound and consistent in opposing American war and intervention abroad. (I also used to think they were good on free speech, but *that's* all gone with the rise of the Hate Crime and Sexual Harassment movements.) After all, they proudly called themselves, "the anti-war movement." But there's no "anti-war Left" left anymore. So either they've changed radically without even realizing it, or I was naive and they were Commies all along. (I suspect the latter, otherwise how could a "dedicated anti-war" movement become pro-war so darned *quickly*, that is as soon as the Cold War against Communism was over?)

It started with the Gulf War, when lifelong anti-war warriors, people like the Red troubadour Pete Seeger and the Reverend William Sloane Coffin, suddenly whooped it up for war. Even Noam Chomsky, left-anarchist and always a gutsy battler against American war, supported the Gulf War. The argument given by these people was that this was the holy "United Nations" conducting the battle and not really the United States. In short, that the cause of a war-making world government is more important to them than anti-war principles. Showing that these people were not really against imperialism or foreign military intervention (they were always, of course, in favor of foreign *economic* intervention such as foreign aid), but in favor of world government imperialism, and war-mongering.

Well, I like to say that everyone is entitled to one deviation. Maybe it was an aberration. Maybe the full moon was out.

But there are no excuses left anymore. The entire "anti-war Left" has now joined the rest of

(Cont. next page, col. 2)

The "anti-war" Left has joined the rotters on the Respectable Spectrum.

THE EAR

by Sarah Barton

In his second public appearance since being confirmed, Clarence Thomas spoke at a May 4th fundraising dinner for a left-libertarian group in Georgia. Afterwards, Thomas was presented with a foot-tall bronze eagle. Only one problem: Thomas and the group were giving the bird to the code of judicial ethics. Federal judges are strictly forbidden from

(Cont. next page, col. 1)

INSIDE

"Debauchery! Debauchery!" at Tailhook, by M.N.R. 5
Quotes That Need No Comment 7
The Bosnian Serbs Stand Tall, by M.N.R. 8
Kaza's First Hundred Days, by M.N.R. 10
On "Taking Responsibility" for Waco, by M.N.R. 11
On the King Beating Trial: A Note, by M.N.R. 11
Stealing the Pennies Off Dead Men's Eyes, by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. 11
More Quotes That Need No Comment 13
SBA and the Gays, by L.H.R., Jr. 14
"Where Do I Point the Hose?", by L.H.R., Jr. 15
Welfarizing Credit, by L.H.R., Jr. 16
PC Watch, by L.H.R., Jr. 18

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(THE EAR cont. from pg. 1)
participating in such events.

* * * * *

I forget which R first called them "nihilo-libertarians," but take a look at this statement from neocon-libertarian, P.J. O'Rourke: "I don't know what's best for you. You don't know what's best for me. Neither of us knows what's best for mankind." But P does know what's best for the Balkans. He's beating the drums for war against the Serbs.

* * * * *

Romancing the....? Before his Vancouver summit with Boris Yeltsin, Bill Clinton spent the evening with movie star Sharon Stone.

* * * * *

One of Clinton's former colleagues, a Southern Democratic governor, isn't speaking to him. Clinton seduced his wife.

* * * * *

Clinton refers to his wife as "the c--t." She calls him "d--khead."

* * * * *

After church, Mrs. C. threw a Bible at the prez, and then pounded him with her fists. A Secret Service agent had to pull her off. On another occasion, Mrs. C. threw a heavy glass ashtray at a Secret Service agent. He required 15 stitches.

* * * * *

Thanks to *Human Events* for this one: Federal Appeals Court Judge Richard Arnold, an Arkansan and old friend of the Clintons, was supposed to be on the short list for the Supreme Court vacancy. But Arnold is out. The reason: two Politically Incorrect decisions. In 1983, Arnold ruled that an all-male chapter of the Jaycees did not have to admit women; and in 1988, he voted to uphold a Minnesota parental notification law for minors trying to get an abortion. Litmus test, anyone? ■

(HANDS OFF cont. from page 1)
the rotters on the Respectable Spectrum: liberals, Establishment centrists, Official Conservatives, neoconservatives, and virtually everyone else, in hysterical calls for intervention against the Serbs in Bosnia. *This time*, it's not because the United Nations is behind the war; on the contrary, the UN is getting as much flak as the U.S. from this "international community" of war-mongers. Why have they "sat it out," they charge, in the face of "Serbian aggression" and expansionism against the poor Bosnian Muslims?

As usual, there are disagreements about the extent of military intervention demanded; but as usual, the "moderates" are either liars or self-deluders, since timid and moderate first steps will obviously not work, and then the precedent being set and intervention begun, the pressure will become irresistible for ever more accelerated steps, until the maximum pain is inflicted. No-fly zones, air strikes against artillery, all will fail and lead further; and now, the war crowd is beginning to call, *not yet* for bombing Belgrade—the only Serbs they can find and target—but for bombing the "bridges" near Belgrade where supplies are being sent to the Serbs in Bosnia. Bombing Belgrade itself will follow, and when that won't work, which it won't. the Unthinkable will be voiced: nuking Belgrade, using "clean" nukes of course to avoid the fallout's harming other peoples. And when *that* doesn't work, American ground troops—under a UN cover, of course, with half a dozen Brits, Canadians, and Indians thrown in—will be next.

And one of the reasons none of these measures will work, is because the Serbs are a magnificently gutsy people, a "primitive" folk who don't give a tinker's dam for "world opinion," the "respect of the international community," and all the rest of the pretentious cant that so impresses readers of the *New York Times*. What do the Serbs want? It's very clear what they want, and there is no need for the sort of eternal *kvetching* that Freud indulged in about "what do women want?" The Serbs want all the Serbs in former Yugoslavia to be part of a new Greater Serbia being carved out of the ethnic mess in the Balkans. They want a Serb nation, and they don't give a rap for any of the considerations that so intensely motivate Establishment World Opinion, and God bless them for that. World Opinion, in turn, doesn't give a rap for a Serb nation. But why should World Opinion hold sway *anywhere*?

Before dealing with the Serbs

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in depth, let us focus a bit more on the pro-war anti-war movement people whom Harry Elmer Barnes bitterly used to call "the pro-war pacifists." This gang has just written an open letter to the UN, President Clinton, and the US Congress (published in *In These Times*, April 19-May 2). Of course, they are "moderate"; no call, yet for nuking Belgrade. Also, there are the usual Marxoid obeisances to the "democratic opposition in Serbia," an "opposition" generally confined to Belgrade, and virtually non-existent on the Bosnian front. What they want is the supposedly "even handed" approach of lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnians, so that the Bosnian Muslim government can "defend itself." Sounds fine and balanced on the surface, except that these and similar groups egregiously omit the fact that the UN, prodded by the US, has been cruelly imposing an embargo, not just on arms, but *on everything else*, on the Serbs for many months. I would be all in favor of lifting our arms embargo on the Bosnians *provided that* all international sanctions against the Serbs were lifted as well. But, of course, our pro-war anti-warriors say not a peep about this. Instead, they demand: "vigorous prosecution of war criminals" (who? where? and who's going to do all this, and who will kidnap these "criminals," and how will they get a fair trial and on precisely *what* ex post facto charges?); and "air lifting humanitarian aid, under military protection, to all civilians in need." (You mean like dropping those food mounds?) Furthermore, in addition to denouncing "aggressive Serb expansionism," these bloodthirsty "anti-war" warriors also have the nerve to demand that the US/UN insist that "the Croats cease their aggression in Bosnia." (*What* aggression? The Croats have only occupied Croatian areas in Bosnia, notably Herzegovina in the southern part of that province.) This attack on the Croats shows what these ex-anti-warriors are up to: shilling for the Bosnian Muslim government, which presumes to speak for a non-entity called the "Bosnian nation" and its alleged "territorial integrity," a "nation" that sprang into existence only a few short months ago.

Harry Elmer Barnes bitterly called these people "the pro-war pacifists."

Let us emphasize: there is not, and never was, anything called a "Bosnian nation." There was and is a Serbian nation, a Croat nation, and a Slovene nation, each with identifiable longtime national, cultural, and ethno-religious characteristics. There is no more a "Bosnian nation" than there is a "nation" of North Dakota. Bosnia is simply a geographical entity, in which have lived three very different, clashing, and mutually antagonistic nations; the Serbs, the Croats, and the "Bosnian" Muslims. These are three nations slugging it out in one small territory.

But first let us name these traitorous ex-anti-warriors, now shilling for global military intervention on behalf of the Muslim government. The signatories include: Israeli Hegelian political theorist Shlomo Avineri; Noam Chomsky; Christopher Hitchens; CUNY shrink Robert Jay Lifton; Michael Lerner, editor of the "pro- peace" *Tikkun*; Michael Foot, dotty guru of the Leftwing of the British Labor Party; Bogdan Denitch, of CUNY and long-time socialist; Chilean pest Ariel Dorfman; Berkeley sociologist Todd Gitlin, participant-historian of the old New Left; Joanne Landy, of the "Campaign for Peace (sic) and Democracy," former leader of the Draperite "Third Camp" wing of international Trotskyism; Phyllis Jacobson, of *New Politics* magazine, another spinoff magazine of "independent Marxist-Leninists"; Peter Weiss, long- time financier of Leftist causes in New York; and Columbia University's lionized moderate Palestinian Arab and literary deconstructionist, Edward Said.

May they all wind up in Srebrenica to greet the Serbs as they come marching in!

But what about us at RRR? Haven't we, too, flip-flopped in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the opposite direction? Aren't we former anti-Serbs now born again as pro-Serbs?

Not quite. To recall those dear dead days of only a few months ago: the United States, along with the UN, and all Received Opinion, including leftists/liberals/Centrists/Official Conservatives/ and neocons, were all fanatically pro-Serb, calling for the old Wilsonian-Rooseveltian "guarantee of the territorial integrity of 'Yugoslavia,'" and therefore bitterly hostile to all national secessionist movements, including the Croats and Slovenes. The Croats, in particular, were constantly smeared by Received Opinion as being "Nazis."

We at RRR, on the other hand, always Out of Step with Received Opinion, recognized from way back that "Yugoslavia" is not, and never has been, a nation, that it was born of the rotten Victors' Peace imposed by the Entente Powers (redubbed the "Allies" Britain, France, and the U.S.) at Versailles and in other dictated settlements after World War I. Yugoslavia was a geographical expression which served only as a mask for Serbian imperialism and dictatorship over the other peoples incarcerated into that expression: notably the Croats and the Slovenes.

For the problem with the Serbs was, and still is, that while yearning for the perfectly acceptable ideal of a Greater Serbia, that they have not been exactly reticent or scrupulous in avoiding expansion of the Serbs' unwelcome embrace to the Croats etc. in the Balkans.

So we at RRR were always, and still are, staunchly opposed to "Yugoslavia" or any of its pomp and works.

But now that Yugoslavia has fallen apart, and has collapsed into its constituent peoples and nationalities, the situation is very different. The Serbs seem to have abandoned the goal of a Greater Yugoslavia, and have moderated their demands into the perfectly reasonable one of a Greater Serbia. And the guerrilla warfare on the ground has, more or less, sorted it all out, as it always does: with each nationality getting more or less its own ethnic areas. Much of Croatia in the hands of Serbian guerrillas and incorporated into the Republic of Krajina is ethnically Serb; the Slovenes have ethnic Slovenia, etc.

Bosnia, with its ethno-religious mixture of villages and populations, is particularly difficult to sort out, but even Bosnia now enjoys rough ethno-religious justice with the Croats running the Croatian areas of Herzegovina, the Serbs running their areas, and so on. The Bosnian Muslims have less territory than the others because most of the Muslims are concentrated in the large Bosnian cities, such as Sarajevo.

And so rough ethnic justice has come to Bosnia, and it will sort itself out provided that the blankety-blank US/UN combo keeps its hands off. If the Bosnian Muslims get a bit less than their quota, so what? The main problem now in former Yugoslavia is not the Serbs but the pretensions of the Bosnian Muslim government to run and dominate *all* of Bosnia-Herzegovina. It is the Muslims and their shills in "world opinion" who keep bleating about the "territorial integrity" of this non-existent nation, an "integrity" that didn't even exist before 1991. It is the Muslims and their shills who refuse to agree to the "cantonization" of Bosnia, a process that that area sorely needs. The Vance-Owen plan was only a feeble step in that direction, for it insisted on preserving the powers of a central Bosnian (Muslim) government. Instead, the only hope of genuine peace and justice is to destroy "Bosnia" and to allow this non-country to be divided completely into its constituent parts.

What is really incomprehensible is the intensity of the flip-flop on the Serbs from the serried ranks of Received Opinion. The Serbs...are Serbs, and always have been, with their vices and virtues. The Serbs are a constant factor; they want a Greater Serbia, as much as they can get, but are willing in the end to settle for Serb lands. And so are all the other nationality groups in the area. But what about the dread term "ethnic cleansing," repeated like a mantra in every news item in the West for months? Well, in the first place, the Serbs didn't *say* "ethnic cleansing"; they used some Serbo-Croat phrase and that doesn't sound so bad. Serbs have recently claimed mistranslation; that what they really meant is "ethnic transfer." And it makes sense: the Serbs don't want to exterminate clashing peoples; they just want them *out* of predominantly Serb areas, out of Greater Serbia. And let us not forget that it has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been the sainted Bosnian Muslim troops who have done their darndest to prevent UN workers from getting Muslim civilians out of Srebrenica and other Muslim towns; they want the Muslim civilians staying there in mortal danger, to keep world pressure on for these towns to become part of Muslim Bosnia. *All* these clashing groups perform ethnic transfer/cleansing when they can get away with it.

And what about the mass rapes, which have brought Left Feminists screaming into the kill-the-Serbs camp? Well, I don't want to disillusion any tender souls, but almost *all* victorious troops through history, commit systemic rapin' and lootin' of the vanquished. It's called the "spoils of war," and will continue to exist, despite received opinion, so long as war exists. Trying to *expand* the war, as the Establishment is doing, will only prolong and expand the looting and raping. And yes, it hasn't only been the *Serbs* who have committed these crimes, believe me; all the groups do it, and it's just that the Serbs have been better fighters in this civil war and so have had more occasion to indulge in this time-honored practice.

Trying to *expand* the war, as the Establishment is doing, will only expand the looting and raping.

American meddling is made even more futile by the fact that it is impossible for Americans to understand, not only these fierce rivalries, but the tremendous sense of *history* they all possess. How can Americans, who have no historical memory whatever and scarcely remember when Reagan was president, possibly understand these peoples of the Balkans, to whom the great 15th century battle against the invading Turks is as real, nay *more* real, than yesterday's dinner? To the Serbs and the Croats, the Bosnian Muslims are not the "gentle people" lionized in Western propaganda. The Bosnian Muslims are not only still reviled as traitors selling out to the hated Turks, but in addition, the very quality of their devotion to Islam is in question. For the Bosnian Muslims were once the hated Bogomil heretics, a Manichaean heresy with horrifying implications, and there is much evidence that the Muslims still practice their Bogomil rites in secret, engraving its symbols on their tombstones. The Bogomils were what Ayn Rand followers wrongly believe all Christians to be: believers that the world of matter and the flesh are pure evil created by Satan, whereas the spirit is good and created by God. As for the Nazi question, the Serbs tried to be as much "pro- Nazi" as the Croats (a minority) but weren't trusted by the Germans, whereas the "gentle" Bosnian Muslims enlisted in proportionately far greater numbers in the Waffen SS than did the Croats or Serbs. So let's stop romanticizing the Bosnian Muslims. Let them take their chances on their own.

So what to do about Bosnia? What do to do about the Serbs? The answer, as repugnant as it is to this meddling age, is to stay the Hell out. Let the peoples of Bosnia and the Balkans slug it out and sort it out.

US Out of Bosnia and the Balkans, hands off the Serbs, and let these people sort it out among themselves. If any of our host of desk-bound warriors, from Abe Rosenthal to Mrs. Thatcher to Christopher Hitchens to Noam Chomsky, want to fight the Serbs, let them parachute into Krajina or Srebrenica and slug it out, mano a mano. Frankly, in any kind of a fair fight, my nickel is on the Serbs. Every time. And, by the way, if you were caught in an ambush, wouldn't you love to have a few Serbs on your side? ■

"Debauchery! Debauchery!" At Tailhook

by M.N.R.

Drunkenness and "debauchery" at a convention of naval aviators and their boosters! My, my, my! I hate to keep bringing up Claude Rains and his "shocked! shocked!" at gambling in *Casablanca*, but it seems to be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the appropriate response for this nonsense. Drunkenness at a social hospitality suite at a convention! And in Las Vegas yet—that model city for strait-laced propriety! Hey, give me a break!

I am a great fan of quaint and obsolete words; I haven't heard that lovely word "debauchery" for many a year. I can see Victorians using it about eighteenth-century excesses. "Debauchery!" But since when has debauchery been a high crime, or drunkenness off the job for that matter?! Our culture is getting rapidly crazier at an accelerating rate, and the poor guys at Tailhook are caught in a culture loop, victims of a new and raging form of Left Victorianism.

The poor guys at Tailhook are victims of a new and raging form of Left Victorianism.

And this Inspector General Derek J. Vander Schaaf, the guy who wrote the Tailhook investigatory report, must be a real doozy. He reports, with a great air of concern, that while the "symposium aspects of Tailhook '91 were reasonably educational and professionally presented," that, horrors! less than 2,100 people attended these "professional events," while as many as 4,000 naval officers came to the convention, which means—ye gods!—that maybe half the attendees came only to participate in the "social" events and not to attend the symposium at all!

Look, Derek baby, let me clue you in on the facts of professional life. I have never attended any convention, even the most staid, where the socializers did not outnumber the guys who actually came to the official proceedings. And this is true even at economists' conventions, where I can assure you, Derek, there was no "gantlet," mooning, strippers, and all the other debauched practices you have reported in such loving detail. And precious little drunkenness, let alone debauchery.

All these hijinks, all these piggish fraternity-like practices, most of which, despite all the hysteria, seem to have been consensual, had been going on at previous Tailhook conventions for the previous thirty-five years. Even Inspector-General Derek admits that this stuff had become a veritable "tradition" at Tailhook. And even Derek concedes that the least consensual part of the festivities, the notorious third-floor hallway "gantlet," had a sign posted, saying "Gantlet—Enter at Your Own Risk." So, if this was a well-known tradition, and the sign was up, why did these women show up at the Tailhook convention or at the famed third-floor hallway or hospitality suites? Doesn't this showing up make the basic proceedings consensual and voluntary? And in any case, what's the big deal?

It's pretty clear that this whole thing was launched by that harridan Lt. Paula Coughlin, who strutted down the "gantlet" secure in the arrogant belief that being an admiral's aide would spare her the indignities heaped upon lesser females. And when the young lads gleefully shouted "admiral's aide!" and gave her extra treatment and she reported them in a huff to her admiral, he had the nerve to do the old-fashioned thing in the military: to tell her to forget it! And so Paula went public in a big way, taking advantage of the raging feminist advance in our culture, to bring that admiral down, and the rest of the Navy and the "military culture" down with him.

The inevitable question: do I "condone" the actions of the young lads at Tailhook? The very question is idiotic. I am not a fan of fraternity-culture, but so what? I'm not a member of Tailhook and I didn't go to the convention. Those who went to Tailhook should have known what they were doing. And the charges of a "coverup" that have smeared so many higher officers are also ridiculous. The whole thing should have been thrown out from the very beginning, and the "victims" told to butt out and grow up.

The *real* victims of Tailhook are the naval aviators who were suddenly, *ex post facto*, trapped in the vise-like grip of a whirlwind culture change, the accession of an implacable Left-Puritanism. One of those female military experts that seem

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have sprouted like weeds let the cat out of the bag on a TV news program recently: "We have to get rid of the *macho* culture of the military."

Yes, of course, that's the key. The military, especially crack pilots, are trained for discipline, quick-response, aggressiveness—indeed, a macho culture. A macho culture might even go in for occasional off-duty drunkenness and debauchery. I was reminded of that lovely line from Wordsworth: "Shades of the prison-house begin to close /Upon the growing boy." Because these "boys" are going to be hit hard by the prison-house of an anti-macho cultural revolution. Those young lads who don't get jailed, fined, or expelled, will be subjected to compulsory "counselling sessions"—sensitivity training to fit them into our new "therapeutic" state. The anti-macho revolution will include, in particular, feminization and gayization. That should do the trick. Thus, Command Master Chief Elaine Human, the first female master chief at the Pacific Fleet headquarters, put the needed change this way: that military service must become "gender-blind."

I am trying to figure out the role of sex in this new culture. It's not an easy task. On the one hand, kids in elementary grades are being handed out free condoms, and instructed how to use them, all in the absurd idea of warding off AIDS, because chastity for teen-agers and sub-teen agers is supposed to be ridiculous. On the other hand, drunkenness and debauchery have to be outlawed for adults, including the military. And what is a truly "gender-blind" and "trans-gender-blind" military going to look like? If gender-blinding is a serious goal, then there will have to be total integration, into every aspect of the military: combat, submarines, showers, toilets, of all genders and trans-genders: men, women, gays, lesbians, cross-dressers, trans-sexuals, hermaphrodites, and whatever other sexes the Left will have dreamed up. And while all these assorted "genders" will have to be integrated in all activities, *any* sexual action or thought of any kind: not simply "groping" and "fondling" but also leers, ogling, and verbal references of any kind—all of which have been defined as "sexual harassment"—will be outlawed to the hilt, with disgrace, imprisonment, expulsion,

Quotes That Need No Comment

Statistics are the bedrock on which democracy is built. — Carol Carson, head of the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce

The bizarre pyramid of federal actions that led to the frying of 86 Christians—merely suspected of wrongdoing until federal storm troopers attacked their church during services Feb. 28—could brand the Clinton presidency as surely as the Bay of Pigs set its mark on that of John Kennedy.... One is reminded of Peter Ustinov as Nero in the 1951 film "Quo Vadis".... Perhaps we need to be reminded, however, that it is Nero who is depicted in the film as being insane—not the Christians, who need only have denied their faith to be spared. — *Las Vegas Review-Journal*

Three months into the Clinton presidency, his third choice for attorney general has yet to hire a staff, and appears to have "led" the final Waco fiasco Monday from some closet in the FBI building.

Why has Janet Reno no personal staff? Hillary and her PC police are presumably still out beating the bushes for the proper ratio of lesbians, Marxists and other minorities. — *Las Vegas Review-Journal*

If the clown act of Reno, Sessions and Clinton juggling their conflicting explanations makes Larry, Curly and Moe look downright balletic, imagine how a Clinton team... might manage a somewhat larger action—say, a war in Bosnia. — *Las Vegas Review-Journal*

There has been some European sniping at [Venezuelan UN delegate Diego] Arria for trying to lead [the UN] on Bosnia. "Arria can be as irate as he wants, but it's not going to be the Venezuelan army that will march up the hill in Bosnia," a senior European diplomat told reporters. "That army is only good for marching toward the presidential palace in Caracas." — *Los Angeles Times*

So we're back to national origins, which leaves out people like me whose relevant ethnicity is regional American. — Virginia Postrel in *Reason*

Classical liberals...should be free thinkers, meliorists, inveterate volunteers, sterling neighbors, faithful friends, devoted parents, attentive lovers.... They should be fervent egalitarians. — Paul R. Weaver in *Reason*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and maybe castration as the instant punishment.

How can they give out compulsory condoms and still outlaw any sexual thought much less action? How can something be "indecent exposure" at Tailhook and yet be compulsory in barracks and showers in the name of "gender-blinding"? How can we possibly make sense out of this crazy quilt of sexual attitudes? Perhaps the answer is this: the Enemy is what used to be called "normal," or "macho," hetero-sex. *Anything* else, any kind of transgendering, is good, healthy, a liberating "orientation," etc. That seems to be what the military, and the rest of us, are in for.

Well, one thing I'm sure of. After a steady diet of the new culture, we won't have to worry about the military and its "macho culture." It will be very interesting to see what will happen when the new, liberated, sensitive, feminized, gayized, and trans-genderized Army, Navy, and Air Force run up against the Serbs, who, God bless them!, haven't caught up with the modern world yet.

To repeat a point I've made elsewhere: *who* would you rather have defend you, a feminized, gayized, de-machoized military, or a group of Serbs? Think about it. ■

The Bosnian Serbs Stand Tall

by M.N.R.

In a world that honors charlatans, plagiarists, and multicultural Reds, I wonder if we still have the capacity to recognize and salute authentic heroes. If we do, we should acknowledge the historic moment in the early morning of May 6 when the parliament of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia took its final stand, and told the paladins of the "international community" to go to Hell, and, in effect, offered to send them there.

At the Heavenly Valley Hotel near the ski slopes of Mount Jahorina, twenty miles southeast of Sarajevo, the Serbian Republic parliament considered the Vance-Owen peace plan for the third and last time. Tremendous pressure was applied on the Bosnian Serbs. Clinton and the UN had already tightened the cruel embargo against Serbia, and President Clinton was making war threats, and muttering about bombing Serbian artillery. In addition to pleas for accepting Vance-Owen from the President of Greece, who journeyed to Mount Jahorina for the occasion, their supposedly beloved President of Serbia, Slobodan ("Slobo") Milosevic came there to plead with the Bosnian Serbs to accept the agreement, as did their leader, the shrink Radovan Karadzic, who had signed on to the plan in Greece a few days earlier. The Serbian Republic parliament had rejected the plan twice before, but now the pressure was piled on from their supposed maximum leaders.

I wonder if we still have the capacity to recognize and salute authentic heroes.

After many hours of consideration and debate, however, the Serbian Parliament of Bosnia overwhelmingly rejected the Vance-Owen plan, by a vote of 51 to 2, although 12 deputies abstained, and 17 had left the assembly in defeat before the vote was taken.

Our supposed champions of "democracy," of course, pursued their usual course of implicitly defining "democracy" as "voting the way I say." Have you ever noticed how quick our liberal/Official Conservative/neocon Establishment is to denigrate and smear democratic voting that goes the "wrong" way? From the very beginning, our "objective" media denigrated and sneered at the Bosnian Serb parliament, continually referring to it as "self-styled," "self-proclaimed," "self-named," or "self-designated." Well, who do they think proclaimed, named, or designated, the parliaments of the new republics of Slovenia or Croatia? Or, for that matter, of Kazakhstan and Ukraine? I suppose that a similar Establishment in 1776 would have sneered at the Continental Congress meeting in Philadelphia as "self-designated." So

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what, and which group does not arise in the same way?

Of course, these gentry could be implying that this Serbian Republican parliament of 82 delegates does not really represent the Serbs of Bosnia, that they are just a ragtag group with no influence outside the rooms in which they meet. Well, the American media people, including such war hawks as Leslie Gelb and Anthony Lewis and William Safire, are very welcome to test the proposition: to fly into Eastern Bosnia and to find out. To ask some Serbs on the spot whom they follow. It would be an interesting experiment in cultural exchange and "learning about other peoples." Somehow I think that Gelb & Co. would not last very long.

Americans have always been constitutionally incapable of thinking that designated enemy countries really back any policy contrary to the U.S. Establishment. At first, the theory was that Slobo was the bad guy, an evil Commie who was somehow manipulating, and dictating to, the Serbs of Bosnia. They never understood that Commie, Shmommie, Milosevic is a Serb: Right, Left, and Center are not important in this context. So how come Slobo pleaded for peace, and the Bosnian Serb Parliament listened politely and then voted the other way? At first the American Establishment thought it was a devilish trick by Slobo, until they finally became convinced that Gee, Slobo seems to have become a Good Guy and yet the Bosnian Serbs are still intransigent.

Then the focus shifted to the shrink Dr. Karadzic. *He* is their leader, and if he can be pressured into folding, surely the slavish Bosnian Serb masses would follow. But no, once again, Parliament heard Karadzic to the end, and then voted the other way.

What got into the Serbs?

What got into them is very simple. These Bosnian Serb delegates are on the front lines, they and their men have been fighting and dying. Inch by inch and yard by yard, in a fierce and savage conflict, they have finally taken almost all the Serb areas in Bosnia. And then you expect them to listen to Slobo, fresh from sitting safely in Belgrade, or even Dr. Karadzic, from his comfortable medical office in Sarajevo? Counselling them to lay down their arms? Never, for accepting the Vance-Owen plan would mean, first and foremost, that the Bosnian Serbs would have to abandon almost half the territory they fought and bled over, pulling out from their occupation of 70 percent of Bosnia, and back to only 43 percent of Bosnian territory.

The reply of the Serbs on the spot, the men in the front lines, is simple: "Never!" Serb sentiment was best expressed by deputy Vojo Beric, a simple soldier, who vowed: "We will never live together with Muslims and Croats again. And we will never give up our territories, regardless of the threats from the West." This sentiment echoes the stirring call of the Anarcho-Communist Mexican peasant leader, Emiliano Zapata: "It is better to die on your feet than live on your knees!"

But the Serbs were also very shrewd in this great crisis. They voted for a decisive referendum by all Bosnian Serbs on the Vance-Owen plan. There is no doubt how the Serbian masses of Bosnia will vote. The American Establishment sputters that the referendum is only a "delaying tactic," which of course it is, but it is also much more: for it takes all the prattle of the American Social Democrat Establishment about "democracy" and hurls it right back in their face. Surely, the United States cannot start bombing the Serbs until the referendum is allowed to take place. In the meanwhile, every day in every way the Serbs consolidate their gains.

Americans who oppose the madness of Bosnian intervention should rejoice at the Bosnian Serb rejection of Vance-Owen. For if they had accepted the plan, the U.S. was committed to sending 25,000 ground troops (!) as part of a UN "peacekeeping" force of 75,000 to police the entire little-understood patchwork of boundaries that constitute the plan. The US and other UN soldiers would have gotten bogged down fighting against at least three sets of armies, each hiding behind every hill, tree, and cave in mountainous and heavily forested Bosnia. It would have been a nightmare, a Lebanon many times over. And the excuse for all the bloodshed would have been the phony moralism that "after all, the Serbs are violating their own agreement."

Now that the Serbs have happily rejected Vance-Owen, however, the US can no longer march in under cover of a UN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"peacekeeping" or peace-enforcing army. With luck, the U.S. will be all on its own, aimlessly bombing alleged gun emplacements, in hills where there is artillery in every cave, and every soldier has his hand-held anti-aircraft missile, mortar and machine gun to shoot down American planes. The U.S. lost 2,500 planes to the Vietnamese; here they will face a trained Serbian guerrilla force heavily armed for decades with American weapons (supposedly against the Soviets.)

May Slick Willie and his entire yuppie crew come in on the first bombing run.

With luck, public pressure in the U.S. and Pentagon advisers will keep Clinton from going into Bosnia. But if he does, we can hope that Slick Willie and his entire yuppie crew, most definitely including Hillary, will come in on the first bombing run. We can be sure that the Serbs are planning to give them a very warm reception. ■

Kaza's First Hundred Days

by M.N.R.

While everyone is concentrating on the First Hundred Days of the horrible Clinton regime, we should not overlook the First Hundred Days of our young paleo political hero, freshman Republican Greg Kaza of the Michigan House of Representatives. In the May *RRR* ("Paleolib Victory in Michigan"), we pointed out how Kaza took the lead in developing a cadre of libertarian Republicans who were able to forge an alliance with Democrats to place a crucial libertarian restriction on Governor Engler's vicious "no-knock" bill. The record of Kaza's first hundred days in the legislature is now in, and it is outstanding for cleaving to principle, while being effective in either forging alliances, or in gaining losing but significant support for libertarian stands that push out the envelope of political discourse in the state of Michigan. In addition, Kaza's principled opposition has served to highlight the phoniness of Governor John Engler's much trumpeted "conservative" administration.

First, on the status of the despotic no-knock bill. After Kaza's amendment requiring two judges, including at least one circuit court judge, to approve any no-knock warrant, won by 56-48, Kaza introduced another amendment, co-sponsored by Rep. Jondahl, to restrict the scope of no-knock warrants to certain felony cases. The Kaza amendment lost, but only by a tie vote of 53 to 53. At the end of the hundred days on April 22, the no-knock bill was still stalled in the House of Representatives.

In another action, Greg Kaza introduced a House Resolution to reject a five percent pay raise for Michigan legislators and judges for two years; the resolution was approved by 66 to 37, but unfortunately it need a two-thirds vote and so it failed by eight votes. Kaza made his mark as a determined foe of tax-and-spend in the state in other ways. He was only one of ten Representatives to vote against a bill for the State to impose "fees" (a weasel word for taxes) on milk products, but on the same day he was joined by forty-seven others to lose narrowly on a vote against state "fees" on restaurants. He was also one of only thirteen to vote against allowing county libraries to levy taxes for services.

Kaza also became the scourge of "retirement benefits" for judges. Pensions for government officials are particularly galling, because it means that taxpayers can never divest themselves of the burden of subsidizing hated officials, even after they have been repudiated at the polls. Kaza was one of only 15 to vote against increased retirement benefits for probate judges, but then he bounced back to sponsor another bill (still at first reading), making judges' pensions "subject to forfeiture" if convicted of a felony while serving in office. What a marvelous issue! How many long-suffering Michiganders have realized, until Greg

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought it up, that even convicted felons can continue to collect pensions from the hapless taxpayers!

On taxes (in addition to fees), Kaza is particularly effective, since he is a member of the House Taxation Committee. Kaza led the charge in battling against a bill raising income taxes by 30 percent, losing by 11 to 6 in committee, but helping to force the pro-taxers to pass a substitute compromise bill. On the floor of the House, Kaza co-sponsored the Kaza-Jaye amendment to roll back 1993 property assessments to the rise in the consumer price index (2.9 percent). One way of sneakily raising taxes, of course, is to raise assessments, and some Michigan communities raised property assessments by over 20 percent during 1993. The Kaza-Jaye amendment won handily by 58 to 43; unfortunately, this amendment was later stripped from the bill in a bipartisan compromise.

On other measures, Kaza heroically pushed the envelope. Thus, he was one of only four representatives to vote against increased pensions for state employees. Then, in another issue which should ring bells among Michigan voters, Greg Kaza introduced an amendment to strip $1.2 million in tax dollars "for the college education of maximum security prisoners," in the supplemental appropriations bill for 1992-1993. Good God! Over a million dollars to provide college education for maximum security prisoners! The Engler machine, responsible for this outrage, helped deny Kaza's request for a roll-call vote on the issue, after which his amendment failed on a voice vote by the cowardly legislators. Why not save the taxpayers the money and simply grant every rapist and murderer in Michigan prisons an immediate Ph.D? That, along with convicting police for attempting to do their duty (as in Los Angeles) should assuage the "rage" of the "community" and buy off some riots! After this fiasco, Kaza fought until the end, being one of 11 Representatives to vote against the entire supplemental appropriations bill.

Bravo Greg! And the next time Governor Engler appears on one of his handpicked stages, such as the Kempians Empower America of which he is a leader, why doesn't someone ask him about his support for free college education for rapists and murders? It would be interesting to see how this "conservative" or "progressive conservative" or whatever he calls himself these days, will reply. ■

On "Taking Responsibility" For Waco

by M.N.R.

I see that Attorney-General Reno and President W. J. Clinton are loudly "taking responsibility," even "taking full responsibility," for the massacre at Waco. I've often wondered: what exactly is "taking responsibility" supposed to *mean* these days? Does it mean that we get to string them up for mass murder? Or what? ■

On The King Beating Trial: A Note

by M.N.R.

Most Boring Non-News Headline (and TV shows) of the Year: "LA Awaits Trial Verdict."

Best Comment on the 2nd Trial Verdict (by an old friend): "Well, I guess we should be grateful that they didn't have to try [Koon and Powell] five times before they got a guilty verdict."

And whatever happened to the ban in the Bill of Rights against double jeopardy? ■

Stealing the Pennies Off Dead Men's Eyes

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

When I think of taxes, I remember the old Jack Benny radio routine. A thief stops Benny on the street, points a gun at him, and demands, "Your money or your life." After a long pause, the famously frugal comedian says, "I'm thinking, I'm thinking!"

When the tax police take more of our money, so that the government has more to waste and do damage with, it also takes a little of our life, for this is the fruit of our labor. We might

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

want to spend it on a child's education, the care of our aged parents, or a donation to our church. But no, it has to go to D.C. for welfare and warfare.

Karl Marx wanted the "abolition of all right of inheritance." Like everything he advocated, this would be horrendously destructive. To real Americans, it is natural and just that parents be able to pass on their savings to their children. It also makes economic sense, for capital—the amount of which determines our national standard of living—is accumulated for this purpose.

So naturally, left-liberals have attacked inheritance, first because they are social levelers at heart, and second, because they can't bear to leave any private wealth untouched. As a result, our right to pass on our wealth to our descendants, or to charities, is hindered by a mare's nest of taxes at all levels of government.

Unfortunately, Bill Clinton, desperate for more tax revenues to fulfill his spending plans, sees an attack on inheritance as the path of least resistance. For despite broad heartland support, there is no lobby in Washington capable (or even much interested) in mobilizing against inheritance tax hikes. Like everything else politically good, opposition must come from the grassroots.

At the covert request of the Clinton administration, the *Washington Post*—according to Spiro T. Agnew, fit only for the bottom of bird cages—fired the first shot in the coming inheritance tax war. Increasing the federal inheritance tax, said the *Post*, could bring in many billions a year. The Clinton idea, which has been making liberals salivate for years, is to subject inherited property to the capital gains tax. In addition to present inheritance taxes, the property would be assessed on the basis of how much more it is worth now than when it was acquired, and taxed on that increase (which, thanks to the government's inflation, is fictitiously high or even illusory).

Present policy, said the envious *Post*, benefits "the better-off."

Liberals tried to enact this same idea in 1976 (an act of "courage," said the *Post*), but decency overcame the Congress, and the bill was defeated. Now the grave robbers are back.

If Clinton gets his way, all bequested property will be taxed yet again.

A man who started a $1,000 business in 1950, and turned it into a $10 million firm, could not hand it on to his son without millions more in taxes, on top of already high federal, state, and local death taxes. The property would have to be sold, or at least heavily mortgaged. Even family heirlooms, insofar as they are reported to the government, would be subject to the same capital gains tax.

Liberals claim the present law—which only taxes capital gains after death and before distribution—contains a loophole. In fact, the entire value of the property is already after-tax, since it represents what the government didn't grab during the person's life. If Clinton gets his way, all bequested property will be taxed yet again. (Since his mother, according to the *Washington Times*, is a gambler who spends every day at a racetrack near Hot Springs, Arkansas, he may figure he has nothing to lose.)

Here, as always, the tax increasers assume a static economic model when making their predictions of increased revenue. They assume that people will go on investing and saving no matter what the government does to them. But they won't. And we will all be the poorer for it.

Most modern economists—their minds warped by left-wing Nobel Prize-winner Franco Modigliani—assume parents don't save for their kids. (Just one example of the nuttiness of most economists.) But free-market economists of the Austrian School recognize the strength of the "bequest motive" for saving. We all want our children to have better lives than we did, and inheritances help make that possible. Often, in fact, this desire is stronger than the desire to consume for ourselves. Many fathers are more willing to work and save for their children then to accumulate for a possibly short retirement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In addition to erecting disincentives to saving and investment—as if we needed more!—increased inheritance taxes also alter family relations, and not for the better.

One incentive for adult children to care for their elderly parents—an incentive already undercut by present taxes and Social Security—is a favorable will. With parents and grand parents less able to pass on their wealth, young people would, on the margin, have even less regard for their elders' well-being. Churches and other charities will also receive less money through bequests, another socially ruinous consequence.

And any increased taxes will go into the maw of an already monstrously large government. Compare the utility of that to having the money stay in the families of successful people with the mental constitution to preserve and increase it.

The war for American independence began as a revolt against a British inheritance tax. Afterwards, the federal government imposed some death taxes, but only for the purpose of funding wars, and always temporarily. It wasn't until after the First World War that such taxes became permanent.

This "Progressive Era" was dominated by many changes in the direction of socialism. We got peacetime income taxation for the first time, a central bank to water down the value of our money, and, not surprisingly, an attack on inter-generational wealth accumulation.

Such reforms followed up on more of Karl Marx's ten steps to communism as listed in the *Communist Manifesto*. In addition to the "abolition of all right of inheritance," he recommended "a heavy progressive or graduated income tax," and the "centralization of credit in the hands of the State."

The cost of present inheritance taxes—federal, state, and local—is already extremely high. Great fortunes have been devastated, beautiful properties lost, ancestral homes abandoned, traditions forgotten, families weakened, and immense wealth not created. That's why, instead of increasing these deadly taxes, they should all be repealed.

For many people, the idea that a person can own property that he has not "earned" is wrong. But who is to define what is earned and unearned? A good upbringing, not to mention

More Quotes That Need No Comment

"He was our Gandhi," said Democratic state Senator Art Torres, a prominent Chicano politician from Los Angeles' Eastside, upon hearing news of [Cesar] Chavez's death. "He was our Dr. Martin Luther King. It's hard to find people like him who epitomized the spiritual and political goals of a people." — *Los Angeles Times*

"We've lost total sense of proportionality here. But this is all politics, and I've come to expect it," said one aviator who was vigorously interrogated by [Tailhook] investigators but has apparently been cleared.

"We've been criminally maligned, subject to criminal misconduct by the investigators, and I think we're all fiercely resentful," he said. "I don't know one person who's been through this process who's been accorded the rights and respect that any civilian would have had or that any woman in this incident was accorded." — *Los Angeles Times*

The well-earned animosity toward [Clarence] Thomas among some elements of the right surfaced in his Supreme Court confirmation. In an article in the conservative magazine *Chronicles*, Llewellyn Rockwell called Thomas a "racial victimologist" and a "pre-1975 liberal," and even mocked his life story, as recounted in his Senate testimony. "As to the outhouse, a fixture for many white and black Southerners of the time," Rockwell wrote, "there is only one way it can become 'unworkable and unusable.' When nobody cleans it out." — David Brock, *The Real Anita Hill*.

The respondents to Buckley's essays include. . .Murray Rothbard (a Buchanan supporter who is positively frightening in his call for full-scale abolition of the New Deal) — Paul Berman, self-proclaimed "anarchist," in *The New Yorker*

There is no Bosnia. There was the former Yugoslav Republic of Bosnia, but it no longer exists. Now we have our Serbian Republic, and no one can sign that away. — Miroslav Vjesdica, Member of the Parliament of the Serbian Republic (ex-Bosnia.)

"Was it [Somalia] worth it?" Army Specialist Thomas Woods asked. . . ." How many Americans did we lose? Seven? Well, not one of those lives was worth it. I could see going to a place to help a country out, but only if that country is willing to help us back. Heck, a lot of these people didn't even help us help them." — *Los Angeles Times*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high intelligence or strong will, is not something anyone earns, anymore than slums, stupidity, or laziness. That some people have things other do not, regardless of perceived "merit," is a fact of life. The attempt to level such opportunities only enhances envy and socialism.

Besides, inherited property, and the privileges that come with it, is not always permanent. As in the Biblical parable, some sons squander their inheritance. In the market economy, this property eventually gets into the hands of people who value it more, and will increase it. But when the state confiscates the property, the money is always dissipated.

In the coming war over inheritance, who will defend the "rich," i.e., anyone who—after the multitude of life taxes—has anything left and seeks to pass it on? For the envious, it is enough to say that only the "better-off" benefit from present policy. And certainly, if this idea is carried off, there will be fewer of them for liberal Democrats to worry about.

Ultimately, the attack on inheritance is part of a broader attack on private property, driven by the horrible notion of "economic equality." As Spanish political philosopher G.F. de la Mora argued, the attempt to impose economic equality "discourages self-improvement and productivity, destroys personality, substitutes arithmetic for justice, mutilates liberty, reduces creativity, alienates morality, decapitates the formation of the best, contradicts equality before the law, and to a certain degree, political equality."

To put it another way, the common purse snatcher is a scoundrel, but grave robbing has always been considered far worse. It is hardly surprising that our political masters, who should be used as dumb bombs in the next attack on Iraq, would want to enact the fiscal equivalent of grave robbing. While we are still around to do something about it, we should let them know what we think about the plundering of our children's inheritance. ■

SBA and the Gays

by L.H.R., Jr.

Two days before the celebrated gay-lesbo march on Washington, a gathering took place at Small Business Administration headquarters, which tells us much about the irrationality of government intervention as well as the real goals of the homosexual lobby.

With the blessing (if you'll excuse the expression) of its management, the SBA's homosexual employees held an office party in honor of the gay march. And chief counsel Doris Freedman told them to march right up to the loan window, for the agency would now be stamping Yes! on sexually diverse loan applications. As gay SBA official Don Kraft said, "the door is open." And so is the taxpayer's wallet.

The SBA gives lush grants and low-interest loans to politically connected small businesses. The other 99.5% get their revenue from the market. But by putting politics rather than economics in charge, the SBA makes most of us poorer (except the recipients of its largess). This is not counting the many loans that go belly-up, nor the other funds lost through the agency's storied fraud and mismanagement.

SBA's Kraft says the agency should make gay loans because "we have programs that help other groups." That's true. The SBA extends its welfare to blacks, Hispanics, women, the disabled, etc. But rather than expand this damaging victimhood, we should roll it back.

Even if we don't, how will the SBA know for sure? Not all gays look like the characters who chanted that they were "here" and "queer" during the march. This action subsidizes open gays as versus closeted ones, which may be part of the purpose. In addition, if someone is declined for a "straight" payoff, can he reapply for a "gay" one?

Besides, isn't there something haywire about a victim group that defines itself solely in terms of its sexual activities? What's next, civil rights for self-abusers? Besides, the median household income of gays is 42% higher than that of heterosexuals. Along with their high incomes, gays have few if any family responsibilities, and when they start businesses, they have a ready customer base of other gays, many of whom prefer to patronize their fellows.

The real problem is not the SBA's funding of gays, however, it is the entire concept of government subsidies for business. If

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bill Clinton were actually looking for ways to cut the budget, rather than to expand it, SBA would be a great place to start. He could follow the lead of David Stockman, Ronald Reagan's first budget director, who had marked it for abolition.

Thanks to a propaganda campaign by liberal Republicans and Democrats in Congress, Stockman failed, although he did manage to cut the budget in half. But then, as with so many other agencies, George Bush gave the SBA a new lease on life, and our incomes. Its budget is now half a billion, and self-identified gays want a piece of the action.

The gay lobby says its members merely want their rights respected. But as the SBA saga shows, they also want heterosexual tax dollars to support their private interests. To add insult to injury, they also want to strip private individuals and businesses of *their* rights.

When the gay lobby speaks of housing rights, for example, it wants to deny landlords the freedom to rent to the customers of their choice. And if we ever get a gay civil rights bill imposed on us, businessmen would face disastrous lawsuits if they fired or failed to promote a gay, whether he was doing the job or not. As with other victim groups, the normal standards of proof will not apply. The businessman will have to prove his innocence in a virtual star chamber.

This game is not, of course, new. First, a group claims victimhood status; second, it demands "equal rights" as compensation for a millennium of slights; third, it uses those rights, which are actually privileges, to oppress property holders.

In addition, there's a double standard. If a Republican SBA had held a similar reception for a group that is discriminated against, say, Christians opposed to abortion, and said they would now get preferential treatment, the yelps would have been deafening. But here's the twist: the opposition would have come from conservatives as well as liberals, because principled conservatives are philosophically opposed to government handouts.

If we ever get a gay civil rights bill, businessmen will face disastrous lawsuits.

Liberals, on the other hand, think that politics *is* handouts. That's why the Clinton administration has honeycombed federal agencies with gay activists.

Thus we see the coming together of three terrible forces in modern politics: federal agencies, special interest groups, and an economically and culturally destructive political agenda. The losers, as usual, are the majority, who are forced to pay. ■

"Where Do I Point the Hose?"

by L.H.R., Jr.

Just one year after going into effect, the Americans with Disabilities Act is a regulatory menace of historic proportions. More than 9,000 lawsuits have been filed against businesses and communities, with tens of thousands more to come. The Clinton administration wants to expand the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission just to process the paperwork.

Yet most ADA cases never go to court. The mere threat has enabled plaintiffs to win an astounding number of settlements, some of them unusual. For example, a fire department was forced to rehire a firefighter who had gone blind, and to give him back pay and damages. ("Hey, where do I point the hose?")

Little League Baseball had to allow a man in a wheelchair to coach at third base, despite the danger to any boy who might hit him. A public skating rink has to allow a girl in a steel walker to skate, without consideration to the danger to regular skaters. And a private school had to install ramps and new restrooms for one wheelchaired relative of one student to attend one ceremony.

The America West Arena of Phoenix, Arizona, had to build 14 wheelchair sections "in all price ranges and viewing angles," a "dog park" for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seeing-eye dogs, and lower all concession counters to three feet for people in wheel chairs and "people of short stature." (If your sore back is made worse by stooping, tough luck.)

The first ADA case, filed by the federal government two days after the act went into effect, concerned Charles Wessel, executive director of AIC Security Investigations, a victim of brain cancer.

The company, noting that poor Wessel was "not functioning" thanks to the disease and the drugs he had to take, asked him to retire. Discrimination! Wessel refused, was laid off, and brought suit. A federal court declared that the company had violated the ADA by discharging the man, even though he clearly could not do his job. Wessel received $22,000 in back pay, $200,000 in compensatory damages from the company, and $250,000 from Ruth Vrdolyak, the owner, for a total of $572,000.

All these cases are praised by the National Council on Disabilities—the federal agency which oversees the ADA—as proper uses of the law.

Some people, clearly using the ADA to vent their anger against society, aren't satisfied with one suit. A man filed 60 complaints against private schools in Vermont and Massachusetts; two other men filed 90 cases.

A wheel-chaired lawyer from Austin, Texas, filed a string of suits against local businesses for having insensitive restrooms, doorways, elevators, pay telephones, serving lines, water fountains, etc. Included were McDonald's, Pizza Hut, Popeye's, Dairy Queen, Wendy's, Circle K, Blockbuster Video, Eckerd Drugs, and Coco's. Several battered firms have already settled.

You don't even have to be an American to play this game. An Atlanta medical clinic asked a woman to take an HIV test before she received pre-natal care. She refused, was turned away, and though a Nigerian citizen, filed suit in U.S. district court in Georgia charging violations of the ADA and the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The ACLU is paying all her expenses.

When a man failed the test to become a licensed electrician in Wisconsin, he too brought an ADA suit. His disability? He wasn't good at "taking tests." Just before the case went to trial, the state settled, and the man was then allowed 10 hours over two days to take the test instead of four hours on one day, and to have with him a tutor, a copy of the state electrical code, and a crib.

The National Council on Disabilities has called for even more ADA complaints. It says that restroom faucets, public phones, water fountains, and library card catalogs are too high. So are supermarket shelves. (Does this mean three-foot shelves as at baseball games?) The Council even wants "deodorizing devices" taken out of restrooms, so the chemically challenged will not be affected.

The ADA has also radically changed the nature of the job interview. Such questions as, "Are you taking any prescribed drugs that would affect your work performance?" can lead to a lawsuit that will bankrupt the company. And in all cases, the burden of proof is on the business. The final result is to wipe out the ability of businesses to hire and fire according to economic necessity.

Such questions as, "Are you taking any prescribed drugs that would affect your work performance?" can lead to a lawsuit.

Now the government tells us that any "known physical or mental limitation" is a protected disability. But who exactly is exempt under such a designation? Not even the "chronically late," as a suit charges in Minnesota. Watch it, boss, the next time the mailboy drifts in two hours late. ■

Welfarizing Credit

by L.H.R., Jr.

There are at least three ways to expand the welfare state: tax and spend, impose new mandates on business, and politicize the pool of loanable funds.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Clinton is trying to do all three, although we hear little about the third. Yet it is the most insidious sort of welfare. It undermines the integrity of the banking and credit system while being largely invisible to the voting public.

In a free economy, credit is allocated by merit. Say an acquaintance asks you for a $1,000 loan. If you are in principle willing to make the loan, you will take into account his job, his assets, and his character—whether he pays his bills. You can then predict with some assurance whether he will repay your loan, and therefore whether you should make it.

The banking system takes largely the same approach. When a person applies for a loan, the financial institution checks job history, assets, and loan history, summarized in a person's credit rating. Though reviled by deadbeats, the credit rating is a magnificent creation of the free market.

But Clinton has a different view. Forget justice or economic efficiency. He wants banks to make welfare loans that ignore the market-driven standards. That is, he is using the powers of the federal government to force banks to make loans to people who shouldn't be getting them.

The excuse is only too familiar. Clinton says that racial minorities are being unfairly discriminated against in mortgage and business loans. The answer? Dispatch hirelings from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the agency which oversees federally chartered banks, to pose as potential borrowers. These "testers," as Clinton calls them, will be members of minority groups. If they don't get a loan, the government will cry foul and slap big fines on the banks. And given the reward system in Washington, D.C., the testers will have strong incentives to act so as to be denied a loan.

The testers should actually be called intimidators or even terminators. No bank will know whether a minority applicant is real or a federal phony. So whether the person passes the usual qualifications tests or not, the bank will tend to make the loan.

If a man comes in with a stocking mask, a gun, and a note for the teller, the bank calls the cops. But under the Clinton plan, the mask covers the Controller, the Congress writes the note, and the executive branch holds the gun.

Any bank that has denied credit to as few as five minority applicants will be targeted. And small banks will be disproportionally affected, for they can afford to take fewer risks than the big banks.

"This is good news," said Democratic Rep. Joseph Kennedy from the big-bank state of Massachusetts. The "testers program will go a long way to remedying the discrimination that study after study has shown exists in the banking industry."

Study after study? Every year the Federal Reserve System publishes a study on discrimination in lending. But its figures are not adjusted for credit rating, job history, income, or other relevant factors. The Fed always finds that blacks do indeed get fewer loans than whites, while Hispanics are in the middle. But Asians always get more loans than whites. Are bankers yellow supremacists, or are Asians simply better credit risks?

A special study by the Boston Fed did adjust for credit rating, and that pulled the black-white loan ratio within seven percentage points. But the author of the study, Alicia Munnell, admitted to Peter Brimelow of *Forbes* magazine that her study didn't take into account enough variables to prove lending discrimination, despite her statements to the press. Munnell, who also wants to tax the present value of all pension plans, is Clinton's assistant secretary of the Treasury.

Other studies to which Kennedy might be referring come from the far-left Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, or ACORN. They too failed to adjust their data for income, job history, or credit rating. Yet they dogmatically insist that blacks are not getting their fair share of loans. The remedy? A system of mortgage quotas, which Clinton seeks to impose by default rather than design.

The dozens of programs already in place to give minorities preference in lending—especially the Community Reinvestment Act—are tying banks in regulatory knots. This new form of welfare will further destabilize the banking system, something we ought to worry about in the aftermath of the S&Ls.

As H.L. Mencken said, the world is divided into those who pay their bills, and those who don't. How can discrimination

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between these groups be invidious? ■

P.C. Watch
by L.H.R., Jr.

Code Words

According to Clarence Page (*Washington Times*, 4/16/93), the "very word 'cities,' like 'welfare,' 'crime,' 'drugs,' and 'poverty,' has sadly become a code word for blacks and other minorities that many suburbanites move to the suburbs to escape." And what, Clarence, is "suburbanites" a code word for?

No Exing Out

As on most campuses, black students at Ferrum College in Virginia wear Xs on their clothes in honor of Malcolm X (who changed his name to El-Shabazz, apparently without notifying the fashion industry). Also popular are shirts with pictures of AK-47s and the Malcolmian threat of "By any means necessary." White students responded by wearing hats with Xs within a circle, crossed out with a line.

The white kids were immediately hauled before a panel of three deans, reports John McCaslin in the *Washington Times* (4/13/93) and told their symbol was "hate speech." If the kids didn't stop wearing it, they would be tossed out. Meanwhile, black students protested the administration's failure to act quickly enough.

Malcom X changed his name to El-Shabazz, apparently without notifying the fashion industry.

Etiquette in the Modern Age

How is the sensitive, caring heterosexual supposed to respond to gays? Thanks to Michael Lewis in *The New Republic* (5/10/93), we now know. The self-described "goy toy" of *TNR* is also the straight bait.

There are three types of gay come-ons, he tells his fellow heteros. First is the "lustful gaze." The proper response is to ignore it, although "bizarre" hetero-sexuals get angry. Second is the "stalker who talks." Lewis was approached time after time by a nude guy in the locker room, but Lewis is concerned that he might have offended the man when he finally told him to buzz off. The ideal response, according to Lewis, is: "I suspect you are gay. Although I have no objection to your sexuality, I do not share it. So I'd appreciate it if you'd leave me be. But thank you for your interest."

Then there is the "full frontal physical assault," such as "fast ones at the urinals." Straight men relate these incidents in "tones of detached amusement—which tells you how deeply threatening the incidents are." This is as versus the bizarre anger of the recipients of the stare.

Lewis mentions a friend who was late to the ballet at the Kennedy Center, and as he stood in back, felt a stroking in an intimate place. He assumed it was his girlfriend (all etiquette is in the same shape these days), but then was horrified to see, as he became "aroused," that her hands were crossed.

"Looking down he discovered, still stroking away, a tiny middle-aged man in a white tuxedo. Had he had time to think, he says, he would have simply asked the man please to stop." Unfortunately, "he 'yelped' (his word) a yelp that carried to the front row. And the little man in the white tuxedo scrambled off into the rafters, as you would expect. My friend now says that he wishes he had behaved more calmly. After all, he is a gentlemen. Just so."

"Burn the Lie"

Ex-Catholic priest George Stallings, now archbishop of his own black sect, held a demonstration in Washington, D.C., on Good Friday. "Burn the lie, burn the lie," he chanted, as he immolated depictions of a white Jesus Christ. "The black Jesus is coming again," says Stallings.

"You have been fooled..., hoodwinked..., bamboozled...," he told a crowd of 500 blacks dressed in African kinte cloth caftans. "If they left you out of the history books, what makes you think they won't tamper with your Jesus?"

Stallings interpretation of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christ as an "Afro-Asiatic" was backed by Professor Cain Felder of Howard University's Divinity School. "We have extensive documentary evidence that the biblical world was a color-free world," with no ideas of "racial superiority or racial inferiority," he told the *Washington Times* (4/14/93). Felder is now finishing up the *African Heritage Study Bible*.

Colors

According to black writer Portia Williams, skin-color questions are more and more openly discussed. Not "white racism," but the color consciousness and color discrimination that is the norm among blacks.

As shown in Spike Lee's movie, *School Daze*, most blacks believe "the lighter the better," and there are more than 10 discrete gradations, each with its own name, such as "chocolate."

This has many consequences. For example, David Brock reveals in his new book on Anita Hill that the troubles between Clarence Thomas and mainstream civil rights movement stemmed largely from the fact that Thomas is dark and the civil rights leaders are not.

According to Williams, who writes in the *Washington Post* (4/24/93), "an increasing number of dark-skinned women simply refuse to reproduce a dark-skinned child." Thomas remembers being taunted by family members and childhood friends as "America's blackest baby." Williams herself recalls that in her own neighborhood, kids would chant: "Portia was a black baby, Portia was a thief, Portia came to my house and stole a leg of beef."

When she attended a party for the daughter of a friend, Williams mentioned that she hadn't met the mother of a little white girl. "Oh," replied her friend. "You met her mother. The little girl is not white, but her father is.... You know, everybody wants a good-looking baby."

"Come on," said Williams. "No, you come on," said her friend. "This is how it is. Nobody wants a dark-skinned, nappy-haired baby...."

No Equal Opportunity

"Most hetero men I speak to envy gay men," California playwright James Gilden wrote in the *Washington Blade*, a homosexual newspaper. "Gay men have a great deal more opportunity for multiple sex partners than heterosexual men do with their rigid, archaic rules and codes regarding sex.... A gay man can step off a plane in any strange city in this country and find a place for casual sex in less than an hour." ("Inside the Beltway," *Washington Times*, 4/20/93)

Vocabulary Lessons

If a teacher "disrespects" students in Washington, D.C., area schools, reports DeNeed Brown in the *Washington Post* (4/19/93), the students "respond with a string of profanity."

"The B word is strongly used, and the F word. It's the first thing you think of," says Kima Wooden, 17. A 14-year old was talking to a friend instead of going to class, and when the teacher told him to get moving, the kid "cursed the teacher out for a minute straight." When a teacher talked to a 17-year-old about being late to school, the student said: "Shut up, bitch."

When one cursing student was told that such conduct used to merit corporal punishment, he couldn't believe it. There "would be a lot of teachers in the emergency room" if that were tried now, he said. And a teacher said that if she "stopped every single time a kid cursed" and sent him to the assistant principal, "she would never be able to teach."

Qualifications

Vanilla Ice, the white rapper, used to "hype his gangster history." But Snow, 23, the new white rap star, a Canadian who speaks in Jamaican slang, has a "bona fide rap sheet: two stints in prison since age 20." (*Washington Post*, 4/16/93)

Will Six Threads Make a Noose?

Twenty-five hundred Catholic feminists, many of them gray-haired "nuns," recently gathered in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for WomenChurch. "The women leading a 'Catholic-rooted feminist liturgy' told several hundred worshippers, 'Even though we have no bread and we have no wine, God will feed us.' From the next room came snatches of a black spiritual. One floor up, about 120 people participated in an American Indian pipe ceremony. They were nearly drowned out by the 70 women down the hall who were drumming in a frenzy, shaking plastic egg rattles, and singing a prayer to the ancient Greek goddesses of the hunt and the hearth."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mary Hunt, a "Catholic theologian," said the WomenChurch movement was not a schism, because "women's infinite creativity and cleverness permit us to be many things as once." But it is "premature to say whether WomenChurch will remain Christian in focus."

One speaker told how she and her girlfriend have conceived and raised a child. "Kate, do you want to say anything about having two mothers?" one of the women asked the four-year-old child. "No," the little girl answered.

With the atmosphere of a "support group," WomenChurch—although it is virtually all white and all lesbian—says it has six "threads": "Hispanic, Native American, Asian-American, African-American, Euro-American, and Lesbian-Bisexual." Pro-abortion groups were also prominent. But not everyone was satisfied. A youth delegate accused the organizers of "adultism."

"Blacks Ask Recognition"

"Uruguay Is on Notice: Blacks Ask Recognition" ran a *New York Times* headline (5/7/93). A "vibrant, black political movement" is protesting the fact that Uruguay's 180,000 blacks are economically way behind its 2.82 million whites.

A help in the struggle is that blacks are unified, says the *Times*, by "candombe," the blacks' "original folkloric music." Julio Olivera, a black spokesman, notes that the "law says we are equal but really we are not equal. For that reason we have to figure out who we are and candombe is a way to do that."

"We have to figure out who we are and candombe is a way to do that."

"Every year, Uruguay's blacks celebrate their one day of glory" through candombe. "Young men beat their hands bloody pounding out a throbbing beat on wooden drums" while others "twirl colorful flags on long poles or bob up and down with glittering images."

Claiming that the only time white Uruguayans notice blacks is during this festival, blacks leaders say they face an "unspoken discrimination" that has kept "Uruguay's blacks in menial jobs."

"Indifference is probably worse than discrimination, because it creates no real evil against which to fight," says Ruben Galloza, a black leader. "If we had open racial opposition, we might be further ahead than we are." ■

Rothbard-Rockwell Report
Center for Libertarian Studies
P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011

The Rothbard-Rockwell Report is published by the Center for Libertarian Studies, Post Office Box 4091, Burlingame, California 94011. (800) 325-7257. *Editors:* Murray N. Rothbard and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editor:* Sarah Barton. *Publisher:* Burton S. Blumert. *Managing Editor:* Sybil Regan. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Copyright ©1993 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED